Please forward my 9-page objection to The Honorable Jon W. Dudas

Dr. -Ing. Giok Djien Go
Pfahlgrabenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUL 25 2005

phone/fax +49 6126 8949

The Honorable Jon W. Dudas
Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and
Director of US Department of Patent and Trademark Office
P.O.Box 1450
Alexandra, VA 22313-1450
USA

9-page facsimile/e-mail

Dr.-Ing. Giok Djien Go
Pfahlgrabenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

Petition to revoke the Notice of Abandonment of two Appls and the decision of Mr. David R. Dunn.
Positive verdict of FAA's Chairperson Garvey and NTSB's Chairman Hammerschmidt on my patented restraint systems, work etc.

Dear Mr. Under Secretary, July 22, 2005

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted and e-mailed to USPTO on the above-mentioned date or later.

I) Petition to revoke the Notice of Abandonment of Appl. 09/554,463 "Multi-point seat belt"
Docket No.: G6A2

Paper	mm/dd/yy	Document	Theses
E1	04/19/2000 *USA	Submittal of the application PCT/DE98/03270 to USPTO	Translation of PCT/DE98/03270 (WO 99/24294, EP 1 037 773 B1, etc.)
E2	07/15/2003; 08/27/2003	1st OAS	Species I with Figs. 14, 17a-17d; Species II with Figs. 15 - 16
E8	10/24/2003 *USA	Divisional appl. in 1st version	
E9	01/20/2004	2nd OAS (Office Action Summary)	
E10	01/28/2004	Registered letter to Mrs. Draper	Amended drawing sheets 8/2a, 8/2b, 8/3 and 8/4; CIPO > "PRIOR ART",
E11	02/19/2004	Facsimile to Mrs. Draper	Subdivision into four appls
E12	03/07/2004; 03/09/2004	Facsimile to Mrs. Draper	Planning to extend the number of claims in regard to submarining and shoulder belt deflector etc.
E13	03/15/2004	Discussion with Mrs. Draper during my phone call	Her consent to my plan according to E12
E14	03/19/2004; 04/01 *Go	Interview Summary of Mrs. Draper and Mr. Dickson	No objection to my plan

PAGE 1/5 * RCVD AT 7/23/2005 12:32:49 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:+49 6126 8949 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-26

E15	03/24/2004; 04/05*USA	Submittal of the amended divisional appl. in 2nd version	Amended claims 42 – 73 and extended claims 74 – 77 and 78 – 90
E16	04/01/2004	Facsimile to Mrs. Draper	Reinstating the correction of the results of the discussion with her 03/15/2004 and her consent
E17	06/16/2004	3rd OAS	
E18	08/26/2004	Submittal of the amended appl.	In compliance with E17 etc.
E19	08/31/2004	Minor amendment of E18	
E20	10/12/2004	Advisory Action of ERC (Eric D Culbreth)	
E21	10/17/2004	9-page facsimile to ERC	Incl. my letter of 08/26/2004 (E18) to Mrs. Draper
E22	10/26/2004	Interview Summary of ERC	
E23	11/05/2004	Substitute appl.	In compliance with E22, E17 etc.
E24	11/23/2004	Detailed Action of ERC	Demand for paying 3-month extension fee
E25	12/12/2004	Facsimile	Response to E24 that it is wrong
E26	04/05/2005	Registered letter	Both independent claims in reference to CIPO's notice of allowance
E27	06/22/2005	Notice of Abandonment	

*USA = day of being registered by USPTO

In the specification (E8) the term "a stiff third transport-system member" is listed in Description as well as in the Claim 1, listed hereafter:

"Stiff third transport-system member"	Floor **6** of the transport system adjacent to the second seat-side or seat-backrest frame at the second seat-side or post section adjacent to the second seat-side.

1. A multi-point seat belt for increasing survival chance of a passenger of a transport system in an accident or during in-flight turbulence, comprising

a first and second shoulder belt portion, a lap belt portion and an extending belt portion **(1.1 to 1.4)** and a first and second belt end (ER) and (EL), where the extending belt portion **(1.4)**, having the second belt end (EL), loosely guided by a shoulder-belt-portion deflector **(5, 5b, 12)** and equipped with a belt retractor **(13)**, having a clamping device, is attached to a stiff third transport-system member, generally representing a floor of the transport system adjacent to a second seat-side or a seat-backrest frame at the second seat-side or a post section of a motor vehicle adjacent to the second seat-side ;

a main buckle assembly **(9.1)** having a master release button **(84)** and attached to a stiff first transport-system member, generally representing the floor of the transport system adjacent to a first seat-side or a seat-cushion frame at the first seat-side or a mid-tunnel of a motor vehicle adjacent to the first seat-side;

at least two latch plates **(2, 2a, 9, 11, 25)**, the first of which is a main latch plate **(9)**, moveable along the lap- and second shoulder belt portion, and the second is a shoulder latch plate **(2, 2a)** of the first belt end (ER) of the first shoulder belt portion **(1.1)**;

a lower belt deflector **(17)** which, attached to a stiff second transport-system member, which, generally representing the floor of the transport system adjacent to the second seat-side or the seat-cushion frame at the second seat-side or the post section of the motor vehicle adjacent to the second seat-side or a side rail of the motor vehicle adjacent to the second seat-side,

Dr.-Ing. Gtok Djien Go
Pfahlgrabenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

deflects and loosely guides the lap belt portion (1.3) and the first shoulder belt portion (1.1); and

at least one upper buckle assembly (4, 4b, 4c, 4e, 14, 14a, 18, 18a, 18b, 18.1 to 18.3) located on the seat backrest at the first seat-side;

whereby

a lower body-part of a body (96) of the passenger and an upper body-part (95) are restrained by the lap- and second shoulder belt portion (1.2) when the main latch plate (9) is plug-in connected to the main buckle assembly (9.1); and

the upper body-part is restrained by the first and second shoulder belt portion, both (1.1, 1.2) extending crosswise in an X-shape when the shoulder latch plate (2, 2a) is plug-in connected to the upper buckle assembly.

The Notice of Abandonment of Mr. Culbreth (E26) is based on a new allegation, made by Mrs. Draper (E17; pp. 5) that I have amended the Claim 42 by including "a stiff third transport-system member", which was not disclosed in the specification (E8). I've already explained to him several times that his, her and Dickson's allegations are completely wrong (E18, E19, E21, E23, E24, E26).

A1) See the above-mentioned term (E8), in which the terms were already put into use.

A2) Mrs. Draper and Mr. Dickson did not express any objection thereto when issuing their OAS and Interview Summary (E9, E14).

A3) They did not express any objection thereto when issuing

1. an OAS (Office Action Summary) of 06/23/2004 on my appl. 10/970,740 with footnote 050304, filed to USPTO 03/05/2004 and registered thereby 04/05/2004 (My Docket No is GA1);
2. an OAS of 06/17/2004 on my appl. 10/970,741 with footnote 050304, filed to USPTO 03/05/2004 and registered thereby 04/05/2004 (My Docket No is GA3) and
3. an OAS of 06/23/2004 on my appl. 10/970,742 with footnote 050304, filed to USPTO 03/05/2004 and registered thereby 04/05/2004. My Docket No is GA4.

A4) In contrary to them Mr. Gruber, CIPO's examiner, has already granted patent on a single appl. CA 2,313,780, filed to CIPO and USPTO on the same day and consisting of 10/970,741 and 09/554,463. See CIPO's Notice of Allowance attached to (E26). Within nine months from the day of submittal all the examiners of EPO and DPMA have given patent on single appls EP 1 037 773 B1 and DE 197 49 780 C2, each of which consists of four US. divisional appls. All examiners of EPO, CIPO and DPMA have helped me become an expert in formulating Claims because they realized the importance of my work and patents, which are superior to the Prior Art world-wide, hence increasing survival chance while lowering the costs. You would agree that the amount of correspondence regarding only this appl. would set a new world-record.

A5) When e-mailing me his proposal, see attached, Mr. Dunn, having no objection to all those terms, listed in my appl. 10/970,742, agreed to allow the claim under the premise that I agree with his amendment on those terms –*which is*– replacing "generally representing". For sure, Mr. Dickson has given consent to Dunn's proposal and offer to allow the claims.

A6) Mrs. Draper, Mr. Dickson and Mr. Culbreth would tarnish the USPTO's reputation if I had agreed to their proposal for only amending "*a stiff third transport-system member*" into –a floor of the transportation system–. All ends of seat belts of aeroplane are fastened not to the floor, but to the seat frames because the seat belts and seats, pre-assembled in supplier's factories, need only to be delivered to the aeroplane manufactured for installation. In order to save the USPTO's reputation I have resisted their wrong request by politely dismissing all their unsubstantiated allegations.

Dr.-Ing. Giok Djien Go
Pfahlgrabenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

PAGE 3/5 * RCVD AT 7/23/2005 12:32:49 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:+49 6126 8949 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-26

A7) Moreover, their request is **illogical**. Why have they given me the permission to retain the other terms "*a stiff first transport-system member*" and "*a stiff second transport-system member*"?

A8) In European vans, like VW Touran, Renault Espace, Opel Zafira, space under the front seat is designed as a storage room. How can one of the ends of multi-point seat belt be fastened to the floor?

A9) My multi-point seat belt, on which CIPO, EPO and DPMA have already granted patent, in an X-shape restraint needs only **four stiff transport-system members** to which its ends are fastened. Thanks thereto all top-managers like John Hammerschmidt, Acting Chairman of NTSB, Jane F. Garvey, Acting Chairperson of FAA, Joseph N. Kanianthra, Director of NHSTA, David Hempe, FAA Manager, Gary Frings, FAA Manager, Thomas A. Boudreau, FAA Manager, John J. Leahy, Senior Vice President of Airbus, Sir Nick Scheele, ex-President of Ford etc. can **easily** comprehend how the X-shape restraint is defined thereby. When reading the amendment, which, proposed by Mrs. Draper, Mr. Dickson and Mr. Culbreth, is absolutely **illogical**, they would be confused due to the obscure definition of the X-shape restraint and classify my US-patent, if granted, as **junk**. Understandably, I cannot afford illogical terms. See recommendation letter of John Hammerschmidt.

A10) In order to find an official reason for dismissing my request for allowance Mr. Culbreth demanded me to pay a three-month extension fee (E25). This allegation, completely wrong (E26), is solid evidence for the intention of issuing a Notice of Abandonment (E27). Despite having reviewed my objections and explanations (E18, E19, E21, E23, E24, E26) and having received the CIPO's Notice of Allowance Mr. Dickson and Mr. Culbreth have decided to issue a Notice of Abandonment (E27).

Dr.-ing. Giok Djien Go
Pfahlgrabenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

I am working to increase the survival chance, in part, of US-passengers, and decrease the annual societal cost, totalling 230.6 billions of dollars in USA in 2000, estimated by NHSTA, only in motor-vehicle crashes, by submitting to all three US-Agencies new specifications, accident reports and my patented countermeasures. Upon the suggestions of Thomas A. Boudreau, FAA Manager for Certification, I submitted to the U.S Department and Transportation new specifications and Directives. Among these patented countermeasures are this appl. and the other two, listed herein. I have been working for the US Government free of charge by

1. explaining to the US experts/managers that the Directives and the patents world-wide regarding restraint systems etc are life-threatening, and
2. putting forward Directives and patents that can save lives in real-world accidents and decrease the annual societal cost.

I thank you for your help and would greatly appreciate it if you would revoke the Notice of Abandonment and grant patent on this appl.

II) Petition to revoke the Notice of Abandonment of Appl. 10/204,827 „ DEVICE TO VERIFY SEAT-BELT USE AND DISSIPATE GREAT BELT FORCE "
Docket No.: P6DA

Paper	mm/dd/yy	Document	Theses
D1	08/04/2002	Submittal of the application PCT/DE01/00611 to USPTO	Translation of PCT/DE01/00611 (WO 01/64485, DE 100 10 415 C1, etc)
D2	09/23/2004	1st OAS (Office Action Summary)	Appl. is subdivided into three groups.
D3	10/02/2004	Facsimile to Mrs. Rosenberg	Proposal for subdividing into two

PAGE 4/5 * RCVD AT 7/23/2005 12:32:49 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:+49 6126 8949 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-26

		and Mr. Dickson	groups
D4	11/17/2004	Interview Summary of Mrs. Rosenberg and Mr. Dickson	Term "use" replaced by "usage". Extension for filing time
D5	11/13/2004	Registered letter to Mrs. Rosenberg	Two divisional appls.
D6	12/21/2004	Letter of Mr. Dickson	Response to D5
D7	01/12/2005	Facsimile to Mrs. Rosenberg	
D8	01/21/2005	Registered letter of Mr. Dickson	Two divisional appls.
D9	05/19/2005	Notice of Abandonment	
D10	06/01/2005	Facsimile to Mrs. Rosenberg and Mr. Dickson	Disclosing that the decision is wrong
D11	3 and 7 June	e-mails from Mrs. Rosenberg	Phone call on 9 June
D12	06/09/2005	Discussion with Mrs. Rosenberg during my phone call	
D13	06/19/2005	Interview Summary of Mrs. Rosenberg and Mr. Dickson	Revival of abandoned appl.

My two divisional appls. are grouped in

Group DA: Docket No: P6DA related to Appl No 10/204,827,, DEVICE TO VERIFY SEAT-BELT USE AND DISSIPATE GREAT BELT FORCE "

Group DB: Docket No: P6DB related to "DEVICE TO REGISTER SEAT-BELT USE AND SERVICE-LIFE OF RESTRAINT SYSTEMS"

Group	*Docket No.*	*Footnote*	*Date of filing*	*Number of claims*
DA1	P6DA	US6A-011104	11/13/2004	38
DB1	P6DB	US6B-011104	11/13/2004	31
DA2	P6DA	IE6DA 300105	01/21/2005	38
DB2	P6DB	IE6DB 300105	01/21/2005	31

B1) All the claims of DA1 and DA2 are defined in association with **only** impact-identity elements which correspond to the Group I (D2). Hence, the Notice of Abandonment is completely wrong.

B2) I may refer to a similar case. In regard to my US 09/554,463, above-mentioned, Mrs. Deanna L. Draper requested me to subdivide it into two appls. in accordance with Species I with Figs. 14, 17a-17d and Species II with Figs. 15 – 16 (E2). When I submitted to USPTO all four divisional appls incl. my letter (E8) she and Mr. Dickson issued **no** Notice of Abandonment and she has examined all four divisional appls (E15), US 10/690,740, US 10/690,741 and US 10/690,742 and issued four OASes (A3) **at once**. Why have Mrs. Rosenberg and Mr. Dickson issued the Notice of Abandonment (D9)?

B3) My letter (E8) disclosed that the Species I for US 09/554,463 were not mentioned at all. Had Mrs. Rosenberg and Mr. Dickson really read my divisional appls. ref to DA1 and DA2 they would have found out that both correspond exactly to Group I and refrained from mailing me the Notice of Abandonment (D9).

I deeply appreciate your help as well as decision if you would revoke the Notice of Abandonment.

Dr.-Ing. Glok Djien Go
Pfahlgrabenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

PAGE 5/5 * RCVD AT 7/23/2005 12:32:49 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:+49 6126 8949 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-26